

Applicant: Daniel J. Pusiol
Application No.: 10/713,344

REMARKS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1 – 95 are pending. Claims 17 – 94 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 3 – 8 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 - 15 are amended as to matters of form. Support for the amendments can be found in the original claims and at paragraphs 5 – 10, 27, 31, 32, 56, 57, and 90 - 102 as numbered in the substitute Specification filed with the November 14, 2003 Preliminary Amendment. As stated in the Preliminary Amendment, the Substitute Specification did not add new matter. The amendments herein do not add new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Action rejects claims 1 – 2 and 9 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The Action rejects claim 9 and states that the meaning of the phrase “cut time” is not apparent. The amendment to claim 9 obviates the rejection.

The Action states that it is unclear how “the application of a process of resonance excitation and off resonance detection (TONROF) recited in the preamble of [claim 11] differs from the method recited in claim 1. Applicant maintains that the body of claim 11 recites elements in addition to those recited in claim 1 and is therefore clear. Support for the process recited in claim 11 can be found at paragraph 57 of the Substitute Specification. Nonetheless, in an earnest attempt to

Applicant: Daniel J. Pusiol
Application No.: 10/713,344

advance prosecution, Applicant amended claim 11 to recite the process supported at at paragraph 57. In addition, claim 1 is amended to clarify the pulse sequence.

The Action rejects claims 13 and 15 based on the terms “convenient” and “higher,” respectively. Obviating amendments are made that overcome the rejections.

Applicant believes that the rejections are overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 1 – 2 and 9 – 16.

Applicant: Daniel J. Pusiol
Application No.: 10/713,344

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Pusoil

By /Douglas J. Bucklin/
Douglas J. Bucklin
Registration No. 51,208

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

DJB/jal